

***The Writing on the Wall #4:  
“Don’t Believe Everything You Think”***

*J. Harmon Grahn*

**The Writing on the Wall #4:  
“Don’t Believe Everything You Think”**

is set in 12 pt. Linux Libertine, available through the Libertine Open Fonts Project  
[linuxlibertine.sourceforge.net/Libertine-EN.html](http://linuxlibertine.sourceforge.net/Libertine-EN.html)  
with title and page headings set in the Komika family of fonts, developed and made  
generously available through Apostrophic Labs

[www.apostrophiclab.com](http://www.apostrophiclab.com)

URLs (Universal Resource Locaters for Internet addresses)  
are set in Latin Modern Mono.

Published by

THE WELLSRING PUBLISHING GROUP

[TheWellspringPublishingGroup.com](http://TheWellspringPublishingGroup.com)

Copyright © 2012 J. Harmon Grahn

v11, March 30, 2012

**The Writing on the Wall #4: “Don’t Believe Everything You Think”** is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. [creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/)

You are free:

- to share—to copy, distribute and transmit the work
- to remix—to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution—You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Noncommercial—You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- Share alike—If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under the same or similar license to this one.

Quotations and derivative works should acknowledge its Author: J. Harmon Grahn; and its source on the Net: The Wellspring Publishing Group.  
[TheWellspringPublishingGroup.com](http://TheWellspringPublishingGroup.com)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>A Radical Proposal</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>An Alternative Path</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Evaluating Our Beliefs</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>A Personal Example</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1	Metaconsciousness . . . . .	8
4.2	Belief . . . . .	9
<b>5</b>	<b>Shifts Happen</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1	What is Money? . . . . .	12
5.2	Making Up the Future . . . . .	16

## 1 A Radical Proposal

The subtitle of this edition of *The Writing on the Wall* was first seen on a bumper sticker that somehow tickled me, and seems to offer an appropriate segue into a consideration of what, and what not, to *believe*—about anything—including, but not limited to, what we think.

On the basis of extended consideration, it seems to me, finally, that no: “reality” really is not very much at all like anybody imagines it to be. Yet how we imagine it to be is the only “reality” in which any of us actually live, move, and have our being. “Seems,” because that is as near as I am able to come to making a definitive statement about anything. Things “seem” to be “this way,” or “that way.” How they “really are” is anybody’s guess, including my own. So all I, or (so it seems) anybody, can truthfully say about anything, is how “whatever-it-is” *seems* to be, at any particular intersection in space-time. Fair enough. That leaves a more or less “level playing field,” and there may be numerous advantages in understanding that the “reality” each of us inhabits is mostly imaginary.

Of course, there may not be very many at this time who would readily agree with me that “reality” really isn’t much at all like any of us imagine it to be: because most of us seem to rely pretty heavily upon our (supposed) grasp of “reality;” and many of us have a more or less emotionally charged investment in our assorted convictions that “reality” is like we think it is. However, I am not alone in my counterintuitive assessment of “reality.” Pioneer geneticist J.B.S. Haldane, 1892-1964, once remarked that “I have no doubt that in reality the future will be vastly more surprising than anything I can imagine. Now my own suspicion is that the Universe is not only queerer than we suppose, but queerer than we *can* suppose.”<sup>1</sup>

Very well then. Giving maximum credibility to those who believe “reality” to be about like they imagine it, let us begin our discussion with the assumption that I may be “mad as a hatter,” and just for grins, follow along bemusedly, and see where this peculiar form of dementia takes us. By way of providing at least some kind of a “hook of plausibility” upon which to hang the argument that follows, allow me to observe that among the human inhabitants of planet Earth, there exist an amazing diversity of *beliefs* about the nature of “reality.” Among this vast hodge-podge of often passionately held beliefs, as a guess, I would say there are at least as many disagreements as agreements. And so it reasonably emerges that those who hold these various beliefs cannot all be entirely “right” in their assessments of “reality;” notwithstanding that virtually all of them *believe* they are “right,” and are to varying degrees adamant that all contrary beliefs are “wrong.” Is this not a fair representation of the spectrum of human beliefs?

---

<sup>1</sup>Haldane, *Possible Worlds and Other Papers*, 1927, p. 286.

If so, then it would seem that “at best,” only one, or a very few quite similar beliefs, are at all likely to be very close approximations of “the real reality;” and that the majority of human beliefs must graduate further and further away from representing “reality,” as they increasingly diverge from those that most nearly approximate it.

To this observation, surprisingly, there might be considerable “agreement” among the adherents to many conflicting beliefs—with each of them claiming that *their belief* is the one most nearly approximating “reality,” and that all others fall far off the mark. But of course, such “agreement” is hardly any agreement at all—leaving us holding an essentially empty sack containing all the universally approved approximations of “reality” among human beliefs.

Among people, the “rich and powerful” (as they imagine themselves to be) hold strong beliefs and opinions too about the nature of “reality;” and are as likely as anyone (quite likely) to fall into the error of believing that “reality” is really as they imagine it to be; and so naturally wield their (imagined) “power” to the ends they imagine they would like to achieve.

However, if they are “wrong,” even with “the best of intentions,” their vast schemes may achieve only half-vast results, if not major catastrophes. And sure enough, the projects of the “rich and powerful” seem often to miscarry, and seldom to achieve, or at least to sustain their visionary aims, as experienced by the majority of the residents of planet Earth. And because everyone who draws breath is gifted, simply by being alive and present on the planet, with some measurable quotient of “wealth and power”—some with “more,” many others with relatively “less”—we *all* seem to be, so to speak, “in the same boat,” and subject to the same disappointments, so long as we persist in the error of believing “reality” to be like we imagine it.

If so, then the remedy for our common disappointments seems to lie in a different direction than attempting to achieve clearer perceptions of how “reality really is:” because, I suggest, in the nature of things, our perceptions will always bear scant correspondence with “reality,” no matter how much we learn about it. Rather, we may achieve more satisfactory results by coming to terms with living within as many different *fantasies*, relative to “reality,” as there are beings who live.

That is, if it is really so that we *really don't know* the difference between “fantasy” and “reality,” and can never reliably distinguish between them, then we have no effective choice but to make do as best we can with our fantasies—our *beliefs*—about “reality.”

The good news is, we are evidently not *entirely* at sea as regards “reality,” because we are able to navigate in the world as we find it, most of the time—or at least, some of the time—without “bumping into lamp posts,” or other obstacles in our path. If they are “really

there," we are often able to steer around them, and accommodate them within our beliefs about "reality." Most of the time. Or at least, some of the time. But, not all of the time.

To be perfectly frank, even the most penetratingly perceptive among us must honestly admit that we are at times surprised by entirely unexpected contingencies: which demonstrate that we do not yet have a firm grasp upon "reality;" and that things are often different than they seem—or in other words, that our beliefs still are not in perfect accord with "reality." Such contingencies are often, at least potentially, occasions for "leaps of learning" about the nature of "reality." Yet however much we learn, our learning always seems to fall far, far short of more than fragmentary and grossly incomplete understandings of "reality." If these chronic shortcomings and oversights may be remedied in the future, we must still admit that they have not been remedied in the past, or the present.

In seeking an alternative to perfecting our perceptions of "reality"—which seems itself to be a task far beyond our reach, and farther beyond our grasp, simply because "reality" seems to be effectively "infinite," whereas we seem to be irrevocably "finite"—what if we were to accept our *beliefs* as our nearest possible approach to "reality," and focus our attention and efforts upon shaping our beliefs into closer alignment with our hearts' desires—instead of attempting in vain to shape "reality" to fit our desires? If we live "in here," in other words, within our beliefs, and have only the most fragmentary, tenuous, and minuscule access to "reality out there," then why not shape our beliefs in accordance with our most sublime aspirations, and allow "reality" to continue doing what it has always done, and being what it has always been; and cease our vain attempts at bending it to human ends?

This is a *radical proposal*, to be sure. It bears the advantage, however, of being something we—as many of us as choose to—can do. It is within our scope, and within the "power" of even the "least" among us. For the beliefs of each of us are our own, even if they are our only possessions, to mold and shape as we see fit to mold and shape them. They reside entirely within our own imaginations, and are at our complete command, if we choose to take command of them.

Of course, it should come as little surprise that there are those among us who seek to shape our beliefs in accordance with *their* desires, regardless of our own. That is the purpose of advertising, among a great many other human endeavors: "Buy this! "Come here!" "Go there!" "Do something!" "Don't do that!" And so on. These are *suggestions*; and to the suggestible, they are remarkably effective. However, each of us owns the prerogative to heed such suggestions, or to ignore them, including innumerable variations between these alternatives, and to take command ourselves of our own beliefs.

Our prerogative applies not only to suggestions as to what we should buy, or value: but also to everything we believe to be "true" about "reality." Our beliefs, no matter where we got them, are ours alone: to sift, evaluate, accept, modify, or discard, in accordance with

the criteria of *our*, nobody else's, choice. No one can take this prerogative away from any of us: for it is ours by virtue of our being alive, of being human. Even if we surrender our prerogative to others, we may reclaim it as our own, at any time, for any reason: for it belongs inseparably and absolutely to ourselves, and is fundamental to what we are.

## 2 An Alternative Path

Here lies an entirely alternative path, from the paths taken by most prior and contemporary humans. For until now, at least most of us have believed that our destiny lies in the hands of "others," having greater "wealth and power" than ours, and may be realized only by achieving greater "wealth and power" ourselves. Few of us have ever imagined that our destiny has never resided anywhere but "in here," within ourselves, and has always been ours to make what we will, or can of it: not by changing "reality," of which we know almost nothing, and is not ours to change anyway; but by changing ourselves; and in particular, by changing what we believe ourselves, and "reality," *are*.

This we know we can do: for we have already demonstrated, countless times, in countless different ways, that we humans are capable of believing *anything!* We have often believed things that crippled ourselves, and gave advantages to others. We have believed, for example, that we were "powerless," and were in the the "power" of others. We have believed that those in possession of large amounts of money were in many ways "superior" to those in possession of little of it—even though *money* is an entirely human invention, with no counterpart in Nature; and whose "value" has nothing demonstrably to do with "reality" at all. Money is a fiction that is valued only because people have been persuaded to value it. What if people—you, for instance, or me—were to begin to value other things more highly than we value money? Might not such a change in belief manifest as a change in the choices we make daily? The significance of money will be taken up at greater length below in § 5.1 What is Money?

In general, it may be said that we do what we do, only because we believe what we believe; and that we get what we get, only because we do what we do. Therefore, if we are less than satisfied with what we have been getting out of life, it follows that we must change what we have been doing. And in order to change what we have been doing, we must surely change what we have been believing. This we can do; and it is up to each of us, nobody else, to decide upon, and make the necessary changes to what we believe, what we do, and what we get out of life. Simple. Not necessarily easy. The alternative is to continue believing what we have believed, doing what we have been doing, and getting what we have been getting out of life.

So the “key” to the whole puzzle seems to be our *beliefs*. Change them, and we change everything. Leave them unchanged, and continue as we have been, steady as she goes, to whatever destiny awaits us at the end of that path. The choice belongs to each of us.

What then, if we are dissatisfied with the consequences of our choices? If the “key” is our beliefs, how should we change them, so as to take an alternative path? This is a difficult question; but at least it is made somewhat less difficult by the realization that we need not worry about the correspondence of our changed beliefs to “reality:” because nobody—*nobody—knows* “what reality really is.” So our criteria for belief need not be fettered by what we or anybody else *believes* about “reality.” Effectively, *anything is possible*; and who is there, anywhere, to tell us otherwise?

### 3 Evaluating Our Beliefs

Next, we might profitably take stock of our existing beliefs about “reality,” and evaluate how we feel about them. How comfortable are we with “reality,” as we believe it to be? Is it frightening? Joyful? Oppressive? Filled with opportunity? Dangerous? Exciting? There are innumerable different ways of describing our many experiences of “reality,” as we perceive it under as many different circumstances. Yet each person develops habitual patterns of perception which, if negative, or burdensome, can be changed. A useful exercise might be to write down how one feels about “reality,” as currently experienced; and correspondingly, how one would like to feel about “reality.”

Each of us is highly selective about our experiences of, and responses to, our perceptions of “reality;” and we all have “good reasons” for our resulting beliefs, whatever they may be—or at least, we consider them so. However, if our beliefs produce within us feelings we don’t like, or feelings that make us in any way uncomfortable, we probably do not have to seek very far for “good reasons” for alternative beliefs that would make us feel a lot more comfortable, if only we believed them.

*Paranoia*, for example, is a belief that possibly unknown others are “out to get you;” and those who hold such beliefs often find “good reasons” for believing them. However, a fellow by the name of Rob Brezsny wrote a whole book about the contrary belief he calls *pronoia*, or “How the Whole World is Conspiring to Shower You with Blessings”—with many, many “good reasons” for believing it is true!<sup>2</sup>

Earlier, you might have dismissed this kind of argument as “fantastic,” or “unrealistic,” or “wishful thinking,” or something along those lines. However, now that you understand

---

<sup>2</sup>Rob Brezsny, *Pronoia: Is the Antidote for Paranoia: How the Whole World Is Conspiring to Shower You with Blessings*, Frog, Ltd., Berkeley, California, 2005.

(don't you?) that *all* beliefs about "reality" are fantasies, of one kind or another, you are at much greater liberty to evaluate beliefs on the basis of different criteria than their correspondence to "reality"—which in all cases may be slight, to nonexistent.

There are many reasons why many people might benefit from changed beliefs; so rather than attempt to summarize them, which I'm sure is next to impossible, I will provide as a single example some of the changes this writer's beliefs have taken in the course of recent years; and the consequences of those changes.

## 4 A Personal Example

Along about the mid-1990s, I encountered the meme that modern civilizations—and even ancient civilizations—have not been set up to benefit their populations, but have been deliberately and cunningly organized more or less like "cattle ranches," for the exclusive benefit of their owners, or "lords and masters," cynically at the expense of everybody else. I had encountered this meme before (which I will call the "cattle ranch meme"<sup>3</sup>), but had not given it serious consideration. This time, it engaged my attention, and I commenced digging into it in earnest; and the more I dug, the more dismayed and alarmed I became that it seemed more and more probably to be "true."

The result was that in contrast to my former habitually easy-going, good-natured self, I became increasingly depressed, angry, resentful, and generally unhappy about "how things are," as I came to perceive them. Life wasn't very much fun anymore; I was not a "fun guy" to be around; and life became quite difficult within the span of a very few rather unpleasant years. The upshot, among other things, was that my family broke up and "scattered to the winds;" and I found myself quite thoroughly bewildered as to *a*) what had happened, *b*) why it happened, and *c*) what exactly to do about it.

Time passed, and I gradually came to some additional realizations, or changed beliefs. The "cattle ranch meme" didn't go away; but its context within my mind incrementally enlarged, casting it in an entirely different light.

I observed that in the overall scheme of things, the span of the human presence on Earth occupied by what is called "civilization"—which I began to enclose in quotes when I wrote about it, because it seemed to me by nature to be perversely savage—is in fact a minute fraction of the span of human events; and occupies an even more infinitesimal place along the march of this planet's geohistory. Human "civilization" then began to seem to me the equivalent of a minor paragraph, or a brief sentence in an epic tale filling volumes;

---

<sup>3</sup>For a more up-to-date rendering of the "cattle ranch meme," you may view the documentary, *Let Your Life Be a Friction to Stop the Machine*, available at [www.youtube.com/user/ClassWarFilms](http://www.youtube.com/user/ClassWarFilms).

and came to appear as an “experiment” for an intelligent species with no instinctual patterns “pre-wired” for human social organization—as have ants, bees, herds of elk, and other social species.

So then, the human social experiment known as “civilization”—mankind’s first (remembered) venture in the direction of large-scale social organization—began to have a changed significance in my mind. It seemed to me no longer very alarming that the experiment may not be turning out quite as anticipated. After all, that is what experiments are for; and experimentalists can always learn something useful from them, no matter whether the experiment “succeeds,” or “fails.”

I observed further that Nature, as manifest on planet Earth, does not seem to be organized along the lines of a cattle ranch; which I took to be an indication that the “cattle ranch meme” doesn’t seem to work very well. Otherwise, it might be expected to be more widely represented in Nature, rather than exclusively among “civilized” humans.

To be balanced, I must admit that humans have developed numerous patterns that have no examples in Nature either, and are not applicable to any other species. Humans have developed extraordinary agility and strength in flight, for example, even though we are not “naturally” endowed with wings. Yet we are able to fly farther, faster, higher, and transport vastly larger payloads than any winged creature on Earth.

Nevertheless, I remain skeptical of the validity of the “cattle ranch meme” among humans, and have reasoned that if it doesn’t work in Nature, it may not work any better for us. If not, it will probably disappear, sooner or later, and be replaced by alternative patterns.

One possibility that has occurred to me was that the “cattle ranch meme” might eventually drive humankind to extinction. However, I found little satisfaction in that line of speculation, even if it is “true;” because there is no future in it. So I abandoned it, in preference to alternative speculations.

These considerations had the effect of removing an enormous burden of self-imposed oppression; because they led me to dismiss the shortcomings of “civilization” as inconsequential in the long term. Those that are in fact “unnatural,” I reasoned, and are consequently incapable of working, cannot persist, and will eventually disappear; or most likely, be incrementally replaced by patterns that actually do work, and are congenial to all forms of life, including humans. Therefore, in their current form, they need not be opposed, because they are already in the irreversible process of deconstructing themselves. This insight granted me the liberty to direct my thoughts and emotions in more “positive” directions. One of these

more “positive” explorations developed the idea of *metaconsciousness*, described briefly in a prior number of this series.<sup>4</sup>

## 4.1 Metaconsciousness

The partially understood concept of metaconsciousness began to appear plausible to me as possibly a generic mechanism for *intention, purpose, design, consciousness, intelligence,* and *creativity* within any matrix of information exchange of sufficient size and complexity: such as, but not necessarily limited to, the network of neurons in the human central and peripheral nervous systems. It became plausible to me that an “entity” with as large and complex an information exchange network as, say, a primeval rain forest, or a biologically active planet, such as Earth, *might* embody a locus of awareness, volition, and creativity comparable to, or possibly vastly beyond, that of an individual human, or a coherent organization of humans; and by extension, that Cosmos *could be* alive, and literally swarming with conscious, aware, purposeful, and creative entities at every scale, from the sub-atomic to the super-galactic, and at any or all dimensions between!

Generically, the human nervous system is a large and highly complex information exchange network, out of which emerges—somehow—purposeful, creative works, such as bridges, symphonies, works of art, poetry, and literature, etc. Impressive as it is, the human nervous system is not the only example of the large and highly complex information exchange networks identifiable throughout the planet, and maybe, throughout Cosmos. Therefore, it seems to me intuitively plausible that the spectacular creativity among humans might be paralleled, or even excelled, in innumerable non-human domains: a concept to which I have given the name, *metaconsciousness*.

The concept of metaconsciousness in turn provided me the basis for imagining that “the way things are” *could be* described as purposeful, intelligent, creative, and most important of all, *essentially benign*, or even positively “friendly” toward the ascending evolution of metaconsciousness itself, including its carriers in human form: such as you, and me.

This thought emerged in response to simple introspection: in particular the observation that I find greatest satisfaction, and am most “happy” and “content” when I am immersed in some creative endeavor; and I cannot help but suppose that this is so for others. There seems to be an inexhaustible zest to the process of bringing something “new” (even if “new” only to “me”) into manifestation, out of one’s own creative imagination. The creative process is challenging, even at times frustrating; yet it is thoroughly engaging at every step—and

---

<sup>4</sup>Grahn, *The Writing on the Wall #3: “How Do You Know That You Know What You Know?”* § 7 Consciousness, and Metaconsciousness, pp. 11-14, February 5, 2012.  
[wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow03](http://wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow03)

beyond compare with anything else, when brought to completion in a fresh new creative work. It may be no exaggeration to claim, "It's even better than sex!"

If this is so for me, I reasoned, I find it plausible to imagine that it is likely so for any entity with a capacity for creativity, at any scale, on any level. Further, if metaconsciousness is a condition of Cosmos, and if it is widespread throughout all scales and domains, which seems plausible to me—instead of limited to human intelligence and creativity on planet Earth, which does not—then literally *anything is possible*: because purposeful intent, and creative imagination, are not governed by the laws of probability. They are governed only by what creative imagination is able to bring into manifestation, that actually works, and is sustainable in practice, as proven by trial, error, and deliberate evolutionary improvement in the crucible of time. The "cattle ranch meme" here on Earth may therefore be only a primitive, or "adolescent stage" through which creative species typically pass at the beginning of their evolutionary development—and "reality" may indeed be far different from anything imagined by most "rational humans," past, or present.

## 4.2 Belief

I have never claimed that any of this is "really the way things are," but only imagined that it *could be* "the way things are." These speculations seemed to me, and seem to me still, plausible possibilities; and I am able to evaluate them as *believable*. They are therefore available to me as enriching additional choices among my plausible potential beliefs.

As to whether I actually do believe any of them . . . now that seems to be quite a different matter. In general, I have found myself *suspending belief* in growing numbers of instances. That is, I don't necessarily believe everything I think. In most cases anymore, I neither believe nor disbelieve a candidate for inclusion within my unique corpus of personal beliefs—which has become quite compact—but instead remain agnostic about most possibilities. This is because I have gained by experience a healthy respect for my own capacity for error.

One item I have come firmly to believe, however, is that whatever I believe about anything, I am most likely "wrong," to at least a significant degree; and that "at best," I am surely only "partly right" about anything I believe at all.

At first glance, this may seem like a rather tepid, if not a self-defeating approach to one's own beliefs; yet I have found it surprisingly *empowering*. It places me decisively in the "driver's seat" of my assortment of personal beliefs: because it affirms that I have no "obligation" to believe *anything* that does not meet my own criteria for belief. No "authority," for example, is able to persuade me to a belief that does not make sense to me; for I have found that I can remain perfectly comfortable without believing anything at all. This

empowers me with the discretion to be decisively aware of exactly why I believe what I believe, and why I am skeptical of beliefs that others may accept as “self-evident”—on the basis, for example, of “authority,” or criteria established by others.

As to whether I may be “wrong” about my beliefs and skepticisms, I have already budgeted for that probability—and apply it as well not only to my own beliefs and disbeliefs, but also to my assessment of the beliefs of everybody else, without exception.

As a corollary, I have found that the plausibility to others of my candidate beliefs is of little or no importance in evaluating their plausibility to me. My meander through life has convinced me that many people harbor beliefs that to me are quite unbelievable; and so I do not share those beliefs. It is only reasonable, therefore, that many people may conversely evaluate some of my beliefs, or potential beliefs, as quite unbelievable in turn; and consequently may not believe everything (or anything) I believe. That’s fine with me; and I hope it is O.K. with them as well.

In this way, I have developed a small and carefully selected collection of related beliefs that may not be shared by very many others; yet seem to me at once plausible, and much more *comfortable* than many of the beliefs I have held in the past. I am not suggesting that my beliefs are appropriate for anyone else; and I do not even claim that any of them are “true.” Their relation to “how things really are” is frankly unknown to me—but then that statement seems applicable to everything either I or anybody else have ever believed about anything.

The aspect of all this that I would like to underline here is the perhaps surprising development that the relationship of a belief to “how things really are” turns out to be far less important than other qualities of the belief. Once again, how does the belief make you feel? Angry? Glad? Relieved? Burdened? Pessimistic? Optimistic? In general, it seems to me advantageous to cultivate beliefs that, *in addition to being believable*, are also “uplifting,” “encouraging,” “inspiring,” etc., as opposed to beliefs that “bring you down,” or engender fear or apprehension.

This is not a suggestion to cultivate “pie-in-the-sky-optimism,” or fantastic visions of imaginative fancy, just because they are appealing to you. In order for a concept to be believed, it must be believable—to *you*, not necessarily to anybody else. No matter what, you always believe *something*. And whatever you believe, you really do *believe* it. Isn’t that so? What is being suggested here is that you have a potentially much wider spectrum of choice before you, as to what you shall and shall not believe, than you may have realized; and in exercising that choice you may include in your evaluation of potential beliefs, factors not only of a belief’s plausibility, or believability to you, but also how the belief makes you feel.

## 5 Shifts Happen

These considerations seem to bear some relevance to the idea of a “shift in consciousness” that during recent years has gained gradually expanding prominence in conversations among humans. Rumors have been in circulation for at least the past 20 years or so that the “shift” allegedly now in progress throughout planet Earth involves a kind of metamorphosis from “third-dimensional” awareness, through a transitional “fourth-dimensional” phase, into “fifth-dimensional consciousness,” which is now anticipated by some to become global, or universal, by or about the year 2013.

What “3-D,” “4-D,” and “5-D consciousness” actually mean to those who use this terminology is far from clear to me; and ventures into these domains—particularly having to do with the not-yet-arrived future—are highly speculative. My habitual impulse is to dismiss them until such time, if ever, as they materialize in my personally experienced present. However, if as is being suggested here, the experienced present is no less imaginary than the remembered past, and the anticipated future; and if one wants to bring into manifestation a future different in quality from that of the past, then such speculations may be relevant.

Fortunately, the planetary “shift in consciousness” has at the time of writing been in progress long enough that some of its earlier predictions may now be evaluated with some degree of retrospect. Tom Kenyon’s messages from the Hathors, for instance, form a body of material that punctuate at intervals the course of human events from February, 2003 to November, 2011; of which *The Dissolution of the Old World*. . . ., September 22, 2008,<sup>5</sup> furnishes an example. Regarding “The Current Financial Crisis,” the Hathors had this, in part, to say in September, 2008—which seems no less applicable in March, 2012:

Those who have created/sustained the dominant planetary economic system are now finding themselves with their “backs against the wall.” This is because the system, as it exists, is not self-sustaining. It is a form of imprisonment and is not in attunement with the shifting frequencies of consciousness that are taking place (albeit embryonically) on earth. And so financial institutions are attempting to re-organize themselves. But this is an attempt to perpetuate that which cannot be sustained. They are simply trying to re-arrange cards in the House of Cards.

But their attempts will ultimately be futile. This is because the current economic system is based upon greed, lies, control, and manipulation, and these thought forms, these cultural paradigms, are not in alignment with the new consciousness that is arising. What you are witnessing is the dissolution of

---

<sup>5</sup>[tomkenyon.com/birthing-the-new-world](http://tomkenyon.com/birthing-the-new-world)

that which needs to pass away, but that which will take its place has not arisen, and so it is a very frightening passage for those marooned in 3-Dimensional reality.<sup>6</sup>

The “economic meltdown” of 2008 may be viewed in 2012 as only the prelude to a process that, rather than coming to a “tidy and timely end,” seems instead headed for some form of global economic failure, with something as yet unclear emerging in its place. Whatever that turns out to be seems likely to bear little resemblance to the economic system that began unraveling in 2008—if it did not bear the seeds of its own destruction from its inception 26 centuries earlier. Stay tuned.<sup>7</sup>

Bringing a brighter future into manifestation, however, seems to involve more than just “staying tuned;” and there seems to be a good deal more to it than complacently rolling over and going back to sleep with a muttered, “Wake me when we get to the Future.” If we want a Future that we are likely to prefer to the Present, or the Past, we’re going to have to *make it up* ourselves. Hold that thought: we shall return to it in § 5.2 Making Up the Future.

## 5.1 What is Money?

As mentioned above in § 2, and discussed elsewhere,<sup>8</sup> and as developed at far greater length by Eisenstein,<sup>9</sup> the human invention of *money* in the sixth century BCE has had immense and far-reaching consequences that could hardly have been anticipated by its original inventors. A medium of exchange for facilitating and precisely quantifying exchanges of goods and services among humans must have *seemed* like an awfully “good idea at the time.” However, what it has led to during the intervening centuries and millennia could never have been imagined—and even today is hardly understood by anyone.

Eisenstein, following Seaford,<sup>10</sup> notes that the invention of the abstract commodity *money*, which may be exchanged for anything else valued or desired by humans, coincided in ancient Greece with the philosophical conception of abstractions in general. An *abstraction* is itself a generalized concept that applies in common to a class of specific items; as for instance *bird* is an abstraction applicable to a great variety of warm-blooded vertebrates of

---

<sup>6</sup>Kenyon, *loc. cit.*

<sup>7</sup>For those interested, the Hathors Archives provide a rich field for browsing illuminating visions of an “alternative reality.” [tomkenyon.com/hathors-archives](http://tomkenyon.com/hathors-archives)

<sup>8</sup>Grahn, A Discussion of *Sacred Economics: Money, Gift & Society in the Age of Transition* by Charles Eisenstein, The Wellspring Publishing Group, 2012. [wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/sacred.pdf](http://wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/sacred.pdf)

<sup>9</sup>Charles Eisenstein, *Sacred Economics: Money, Gift & Society in the Age of Transition*, Evolver Editions, Berkeley, California, 2011.

<sup>10</sup>Richard Seaford, *Money and the Early Greek Mind*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

the class *Aves*, many of which, but not all of which, are capable of flight. It was the early Greek philosophers, according to Seaford, and Eisenstein, who first developed the principle of abstraction—coincident, by implication either as cause, or effect, with the “ultimate abstraction” of money, which may be substituted for *anything*.

Because money developed as a precisely quantifiable substitute for *value*, it made possible the precise valuation of all things for which it may be exchanged—and of crucial importance, *it became a valuable commodity in its own right*. The consequences of this development are not obvious; yet they are far-reaching, and profound. The human invention of money emerged as an artificial commodity that acquired value simply because it suddenly came into existence, ostensibly for the human convenience of being exchangeable for anything valued by humans. Absent this property, which arises only from human convention, money, unlike all of the goods and services for which it may be exchanged, *has no intrinsic value* of its own. Its “value” is entirely a human fabrication.

Whether anybody understood the profound significance of this peculiarity of money from the outset, those who created the money—the “money-makers”—must sooner or later have realized what a “magical” and powerful instrument they had put into their own hands: for they were thereby exclusively empowered to create “value” where none had been before, and exchange it for anything valued by humans, anywhere. This subtlety may have been overlooked for a long time, and commodities like gold, and silver, which had to be mined, and required effort and toil to produce, were put to early use as money; which probably lent some credibility to the fiction that minted coins possessed intrinsic value of their own. However, the real source of their value has always been nothing more, less, or other than the human convention that they were exchangeable for other valuable goods and services.

The “magical” value of money was simplified and streamlined considerably as coins of “noble metals” were gradually replaced—with no effective loss of “value”—by coins of “base metals;” and eventually by “promissory notes” made of paper, *alleged* to “represent” the “value” of “noble metals”—or in other words, by *fiat paper currencies* whose “value” existed only because somebody said so. As a medium of exchange, paper was, and remains, practically “as good as gold.” *Magic!* This trend has been extended to its zenith with the gradual, and now almost universal replacement of paper currencies with entirely immaterial bits recorded digitally within computers. *Sorcery!*

Additionally, simply because money has the unique property of being exchangeable for anything, the widening use of money had the consequence of converting it gradually into a *necessity* for procuring most goods and services; without which they were not, and are not readily available. So this artificial commodity, with no intrinsic value of its own, became the one commodity that trumped the value of all other commodities valued by humans; and consequently, or synergistically with its other “magical” properties, money became a

commodity in universal demand among humans. This empowered those with a surplus of money to lend it to others with a need for it, subject to the agreement that the borrower must return it “with interest,” or return more of it to the lender than he borrowed. In this way, simply having money, and doing nothing more than lending it out, provided an effortless means of acquiring more of it.

Coincident with the genesis and evolution of money, either as cause, or effect, came the philosophical emergence of abstractions: the distinction between particular things, such as “this hummingbird,” or “that crow,” and the abstraction, “birds.” With abstraction came the distinction, never expressed earlier, between complementary aspects of unified wholes; such as substance and essence; matter and spirit; body and mind. Elements of wholes that have meaning only in relation to their inseparable complements became conceptually distinct, and consequently separated in human minds—with consequences that are only now beginning to be appreciated.

The development of monetary abstraction [Eisenstein writes] fits into a vast metahistorical context. Money could not have developed without a foundation of abstraction in the form of words and numbers. Already, number and label distance us from the real world and prime our minds to think abstractly. To use a noun already implies an identity among the many things so named; to say there are five of a thing makes each a *unit*. We begin to think of objects as representatives of a category, and not unique beings in themselves. So, while standard, generic categories didn’t begin with money, money vastly accelerated their conceptual dominance. Moreover, the homogeneity of money accompanied the rapid development of standardized commodity goods for trade. Such standardization was crude in preindustrial times, but today manufactured objects are so nearly identical as to make the lie of money into the truth.<sup>11</sup>

The emergence of money as an abstract commodity commenced the gradual, inexorable “commoditization” of the things money could buy—or the metamorphosis of *every thing* into commodities; and the converse metamorphosis of commodities into money.

And so it is [I have written], like the nightmare of a self-fulfilling prophesy. For the value given to money, as currently and historically used—by nothing more than the common belief that it is valuable—has the cumulative effect of transforming every thing valued by humans into nothing but money. It is the curse of King Midas, and it is in headlong operation right here, right now, everywhere on Earth.

---

<sup>11</sup>Eisenstein, 2011, p. 39.

Money is the real-life fulfillment of “gray goo,” the imagined nightmare of nanotechnology, in which a self-replicating robot of microscopic size, with the ability only to convert the raw materials in naturally occurring things into reproductions of itself—which in turn repeat the process, endlessly—gets loose in the world, and devours the planet, covering and saturating it with nothing other than “gray goo.”<sup>12</sup>

On the basis of 26 centuries’ hindsight, turning loose upon the world the human invention of money has produced a number of consequences for later generations that could hardly have been anticipated by anybody at the outset:

- Money, with no intrinsic value of its own, came swiftly to be more highly valued among humans than any commodity money could buy.
- The artificial, abstract value of money emphasized the general principle of abstraction, encouraging conceptual separation between complementary relationships at all levels: such as between essence and form, spirit and matter, mind and body, the “inner” and “outer” aspects of all things.
- Money, combining concrete substance with abstract value in precisely defined identical modular units, has had the cumulative effect over time of reshaping all that it touches into modular likenesses of itself.
- The “commoditization” of all things has had the effect of emphasizing the “outer” aspects of what it touches at the expense of their “inner” aspects—as in removing the “spirit” from the “substance;” or keeping the “husk,” and discarding the “meat;” or transforming living humans into walking corpses.
- Money, being more highly valued than anything else, has created an insatiable demand for more of it; and being abstract, there is no conceptual limit to how much more of it there can be.
- The nature of money is such that, no matter how much of it there is, there can never be enough of it; demand is perpetually greater than supply; and money is therefore the perpetual source of scarcity, and the destroyer of abundance.
- Money, being more highly valued than anything else, capable of limitless replication, and subject to insatiable demand, occupies a fundamentally unsustainable presence upon planet Earth: at this time, the money economy has run its course, and hit the wall at the end of a dead-end street.

---

<sup>12</sup>Grahn, *A Discussion of Sacred Economics*, p. 6.

We may chalk these up as some of the “unintended consequences” of the invention of money in ancient Greece—locus today, perhaps, of the “first pebble” that launches the cascading avalanche, by the time it has run its course, that may take down, as the Hathors expressed it, the House of Cards that can no longer be sustained on Earth.

## 5.2 Making Up the Future

Of course, economic upheavals are only one class of unanticipated developments that seem to be converging upon the immediate present, and argue in their aggregate that “reality” is not entirely as it has seemed to most people, most of the time, before now.

In this connection, the Hathors have made some illuminating remarks (April 27, 2009) about what they call *Chaotic Nodes*:

Any energetic system that shifts to higher or lower orders of coherency [observe the Hathors] passes through chaotic events in its journey to a new resting energy state. Your earth is no exception to this.

With this in mind, we anticipate a planetary increase in chaotic events. By this we mean that a large-scale chaotic event(s) is near. We call such events, “Chaotic Nodes.” They are a precursor to geometric progressions of chaotic events, and you are at the threshold of such a node.

Chaotic Nodes are actually crests in quantum wave potential driven by the interaction of many energetic domains simultaneously.<sup>13</sup>

As implied by the name, Chaotic Nodes are *chaotic*: meaning, unpredictable. Their timing and nature cannot be anticipated with any accuracy at all. They represent an impenetrable “unknown.” For those able to make themselves comfortable with the ideas being expressed here, this is neither unusual nor particularly alarming: for “an impenetrable ‘unknown’” is as good a description as any of “ordinary reality,” as perceived from this perspective.

For those, however, who are still prone to the error of believing that “reality” is like they imagine it to be, the unexpected arrival of a Chaotic Node can be upsetting—literally, as well as emotionally. And of course, “*Nobody expects a Chaotic Node!*”<sup>14</sup>—practically by definition.

A Chaotic Node can take any imaginable—and maybe unimaginable—form; such as economic chaos; erratic, irrational human behavior, in individuals, groups, nations, or races;

---

<sup>13</sup>Kenyon, *Chaotic Nodes*, April 27, 2009. [tomkenyon.com/chaotic-nodes](http://tomkenyon.com/chaotic-nodes)

<sup>14</sup>Adapted with gratitude from Monty Python—*The Spanish Inquisition*  
[www.youtube.com/watch?v=uprjmoSMJ-o](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uprjmoSMJ-o)

earthquakes; storms, on Earth, land or sea, or in and around the Sun, and Solar System; volcanic eruptions. . . . In a few words, a Chaotic Node may manifest in events of any kind, with an enhanced element of *novelty*—from the personal scale to the Cosmic.

Since April 2009, when the above quotation was articulated, most people on Earth have been exposed to, experienced the effects of, and/or witnessed the arrival of numerous Chaotic Nodes. There have been casualties and fatalities; yet, so far, at least those now reading this (and most of those who have not) have weathered the storms. Read on!

Of course, especially for those who believe that “reality” is really like they think it is, anticipation of unspecified chaotic events is likely to stimulate anxiety, or other uncomfortable emotional responses. However, as the Hathors point out, such are by far not the only possible responses to chaotic events.

For most persons [the Hathors state], chaotic events generate a fear response, since the stability that one counts on to predict appropriate action has seemingly disappeared. And while fear is certainly an understandable response, it is only one of many possible responses. Thus, we encourage you to train your mind to jump out of the habitual rut of self-limitation and expectation, on a moment’s notice, whenever confronted with unexpected events.

From an energetic standpoint, what happens to you in a given situation has more to do with your vibrational frequency, meaning the state of your consciousness, than where you are physically located.

Thus, two people in the same location experiencing chaotic events can have vastly different emotional responses. Whereas one person might be paralyzed with fear, anger, and resentment, the other person might experience the moment as humorous. He or she “gets” the cosmic joke, which is the sudden and unexpected realization that the reality everyone experiences as “real” is nothing more than the fabrication of their own minds.

When chaotic events disturb the status quo, a doorway briefly appears, an opportunity if you will, to jump upward in consciousness, to wake up from the dream spell. But waking up from the collective dream only occurs if you are prepared to step across the threshold.

For a person who is prepared mentally and emotionally to embrace chaotic events as evolutionary catalysts, the near future will be full of amusing incidents, unexpected serendipity, and a feeling of waking up from a mass dream that has gripped humanity for the last several thousand years.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Kenyon, *Chaotic Nodes and Dimensional Attunements*, The Hathors, October 8, 2009.  
[tomkenyon.com/chaotic-nodes-and-dimensional-attunements](http://tomkenyon.com/chaotic-nodes-and-dimensional-attunements)

This seems to corroborate our *radical proposal* from the outset: our experience of “reality” takes its shape much more from the conditions we create “in here,” within ourselves, than from anything going on “out there,” in what we imaginatively call “reality.” And this applies even when/if we are overtaken by unpredictable, chaotic events—or *especially* when we are overtaken by unpredictable, chaotic events. Depending upon the conditions we create, and the habits we form “in here,” we are at liberty to interpret events—that may petrify others with terror—as welcome and unexpected opportunities for entrance into transcendent dimensions of consciousness. This is the kind of response, once again, that puts us in the “driver’s seat,” and gives us command of *ourselves* in any situation; and it is a response that we can cultivate deliberately, and make habitual, and reflexive, in any situation we may encounter.

In this way, we become the Makers of the Future, instead of its victims and casualties. And it is all accomplished “in here,” where we may assume legitimate command, instead of “out there,” where we are perpetually striving with a “reality” we can never hope to understand, or even perceive with any reliability at all.

Of course, the Future that we make up is “Our Future,” or more specifically, “My Future,” not “Anybody Else’s Future.” You wouldn’t want anybody else to make up “Your Future,” would you? Of course not! This is *your* prerogative, not anybody else’s. We each make up our own future, every moment of every day: by what we think, feel, believe, and create “in here,” moment to moment; day to day; year to year; lifetime to lifetime, maybe, in our own exclusive domain: the “workshop” in which each of us fabricates our own “reality:” the “reality” in which we live, move and have our being: the only “reality” we know, or ever experience.

The “mass dream that has gripped humanity for the last several thousand years,” from which we are now in the process of awakening, seems to spring from the collective illusion that the “reality in here” has anything at all to do with the (alleged) “reality out there,” sometimes called “objective reality.”

You are welcome to believe in “objective reality” if you like. Many people do. Yet no one that I have ever met, including myself, have seen it, or touched it, or felt it, or experienced any slight nuance of it. I used to believe in it myself; but now, I’m not so sure. There may be such a thing; but if there is, I don’t have any idea how to find out anything about it, or change it, or affect it, in any way. . . .

But the “reality in here!” Now *that* is something I can grapple with; and it is legitimately mine, to mold and shape as I see fit to mold and shape it, without pressing the slightest burden upon anybody else. Nor burdening myself with any need to interfere with the shape of anybody else’s “reality.” I like it. I think I’ll keep it.

Is *this* what is meant by a “Shift in Consciousness?” Pretty crazy, huh?